

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00005024079



AN APPEAL

FROM

David L. Childs,

EDITOR OF THE ANTISLAVERY STANDARD,

TO THE

ABOLITIONISTS.

From the Pennsylvania Freeman.

To D. L. Child—*Respected Friend*,—A few readers of the Standard in this region, who also profess friendship for our principles, have intimated a prospect of voting for Clay, and the principal reason given, is, that the Standard has been a very judicious paper, and that its late editor evidently means to vote for Clay, and that if *he can*, with his superior opportunities of viewing the whole question, *they can* vote for him. I think, myself, the Standard has given evidence sufficient to lead to such a conclusion, and as the truth upon the point is important, I respectfully request thee to inform thy numerous friends of the facts in the case, through either the Standard or Freeman.

Truly thy friend. J. FULTON, JR.

Answer of D. L. Child.

TO JAMES FULTON, JR., of Ercildoum, Pa.

Dear Sir:—I consider the Annexation of Texas the most important Anti Slavery question which is, or can be agitated at this time. The champions of Slavery, the acknowledged representatives of slave interests and opinions, have declared, again and again, in public and in private, in speeches, resolutions, editorials, toasts, and official documents, that this measure is vital to the existence of Slavery—so vital that they will have it, with or without Union. They do not overrate its importance.

Distinguished Southerners of all parties have admitted, without a dissenting voice, that Slavery must come to a speedy end in the old slave States, and would, in fact, have come to an end long ago, were it not for the American slave-trade. Mr. Wise, in his report at the late session of Congress,

in favor of continuing the gag rule, lays down this proposition as unquestionable, that to prohibit the American slave trade would be equivalent to the Abolition of Slavery. The results of the last census show, that during the ten years, from 1830 to 1840, 321,063 slaves were transferred from the slave raising to the slave consuming States, and that sixteen thousand were used up, i. e. brought to premature death, by overtasking, underfeeding, cruel punishment and sudden violence. This is more than half the number slain at the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, at the name of which, the world still shudders.

The value of the slaves thus transferred, chiefly by means of the American slave trade, estimated at the price of the market whence they are carried, is \$160,531,500, exceeding by \$130,531,500 the total value of all the slaves obtained by all nations, during the same period, from Africa. If the comparatively small sum of thirty millions could tempt the African chiefs and kidnappers to perpetrate the enormities which make that continent a bed of torture to its children, to what excesses may not a hundred and sixty millions impel Christian slave masters and traders—

"A race more polished, more severe than they."

The foregoing results are based upon the actual number of the slaves in 1840, without taking into account what that number ought to have been. It is obvious that there ought to have been a proportional increase of slaves, *equal*, at least, to that of the whites, because it is a common, and I will say, an impudent boast of many of the slaveholders,

will be charged as a by-matter. The effect of it to enlarge and sustain the price of slaves, will be greater, and probably more lasting, than that of all other acquisitions of slave territory. Texas, as defined by act of its Congress, and as we shall accept it, (if we of the free States are capable of such disinterested villainy,) will form as Col. Benton acknowledged, "a great many States." It contains 280,000 square miles, being nearly twice the extent of France, nine times that of New-York, ten times that of Pennsylvania, ten times that of Ohio, and fifty times that of Massachusetts! Mr. Clay has said that it would form five States. He undoubtedly meant Texas proper, extending only to the river *Medina*, which divides it from Coahuila, and not including the portions of that and of three other States of Mexico, which the said Congress have coolly "annexed" to Texas. Certainly such an act is as laughable as it is impudent. Still there can be no doubt, that if we once pass the *Sabine*, we shall not halt till we reach the Rio Bravo. This has always been the limit to which the usurpers, for the present, aspired. If we conclude to rob at all, we shall not boggle at the trifling question of more or less. This vast territory, except a corner in the Northwest not large enough for more than one State, lies south of *thirty-six and a half degrees* of North latitude, and according to the law passed, as part of the Missouri compromise, may all be made into slave States. If one side of the compromise was that slavery should not pass north of that line, the other was that it may march up to it. If through fraud, or corruption, or popular folly, we shall, with all our past expences, and present high price, permit Texas to be annexed, we shall, with still more folly, permit it to be overgrown by slavery. Considering "what amount of spirit" it is, which slavery nourishes, the immense accession of political energy, the security for continued political ascendancy which it would acquire; could it ever doubt, it, and for the most part vain, we and our fathers have found it to render us Congresses, tyrants, and emperors and pretensions, although in our fathers' day there were but a quarter as many slaves as now, and no cotton at all—I should utterly despair, if Texas is annexed, of ever seeing any barrier erected either within, or beyond that territory, which the invading surge would not soon sweep away.

Mr. Walker, a member of the Senate from Mississippi, has put forth the theory that if Texas is required, slavery will flow into it from the existing States, and, passing the ultimate Southwestern boundary of the Union, will diffuse itself in the persons of "free blacks, augmented in the slave States," over Mexico, and Central and South America. He does not suggest any way in which slaves

would be converted into freemen in those States.—Manumission is prohibited by law in nearly every one of them, and without exception in the planting States. But if manumission were free, would it be increased by opening a new market, and by opening the present Texas? Common sense, forethought, and experience protest, with the increase of free blacks, and thereby, of value of slaves. If, hypothetically, the slave would "redeem" them, they would never return to Mexico, or even to Patagonia, if we were permitted to find a level, and the slave to climb. But one of the original, and most malignant crimes of the conspiracy to rob Mexico of her territory, was, that she could neither be wheedled nor threatened into an engagement to surrender fugitive slaves. During fifteen years our slave masters, masters of this government and people, persisted in pressing upon Mexico this impudent pretension. Her reply was, that "slavery was a palpable violation of the first principles of a free republic." Mr. Benton, who started, and recently boasted in the Senate of having started the project of annexation, alleged in the beginning, as one reason, the danger of the elopement of slaves from our Southwestern States into Texas, in which, by the laws of Mexico, slavery had been abolished. The Southern press shouted a fierce assent. A slaveholding republic, they said, could not bear the juxtaposition of a republic which had abolished slavery. The late Secretary of State, Mr. Upshur, in his correspondence with our Minister at London, urged the same thing as a reason, and as constituting a necessity, for annexation. This is the delirium of a pro-slavery brain; for the difficulty is not removed by annexing Texas, nor can it be without extending the slave States to Terra del Teoro, to Dutch Guiana, and Brazil. For there is no doubt that the efforts of the human dealers and traffickers scheme of hypocrisy, sedulity, and rash the alert of a model, the agreed amount of the slave power, by boundless extension, the southwestern end if they can ascend the country. It is probable that this idea will be reduced to naught, in his speech before Congress on Great Britain and Mexico, delivered in the House of Representatives in 1812, declared that "Slavery could pour itself out without restraint, and find no limit but the Southern ocean." The late Mr. Gibson, ex-governor of Virginia, and Secretary of the Navy, said in his celebrated letter on Annexation, in 1812, that "the pioneer from our seaboard would soon kindle his fire on the Gulf of California." Mr. Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, alluding incidentally to Texas, in his speech on Oregon, delivered in the Senate in March last, said that "Providence had given us the mission of carrying civilization and Christianity throughout this continent, and we could

Pitiful and palpable as these schemes of swindling are, they are nevertheless formidable. Tens of thousands of adventurers in them are dispersed throughout the country, and are operating in disguise. I am informed by Southern Whigs that most of the leading friends of Annexation in that quarter have tickets in these lotteries. They are active, clamorous, and, of course, unscrupulous — They urge the people to go Annexation for the aggrandizement and greater security of our rising Republic. They tell them that it will extend civilization, republican institutions, and Christianity, and open a new and profitable market for the products of our factories.

The insulting appeal to the cupidity of "Eastern manufacturers" originated with the late Governor and Secretary Gilmer. It was repeated often by the late Secretary Upshur, a *nullifier*, and most elaborately urged by Walker a *free trade man*. I have been informed that there are manufacturers and merchants who are eyeing this bait, and are prepared to jump at it. Is it possible that Northern manufacturers can believe that nullifiers and free-traders are going to rob Mexico to enrich them? The argument in its best aspect comes to this, that it is good policy to go to war for the capturing of consumers! This would be a new ground of war, and a new kind of protection, as *war* as the protectors themselves. It is supposed that there are not above one hundred thousand inhabitants in Texas, and probably half of them are slaves. Slaves are not permitted to be large consumers. If we are to fight

Formerly sought by all, he came to my power and put the illumination on his subject with a view of enlightening the people to the need and the reality of the Americanization of the race with responsible education. The leaders, the agents, and most of the teachers were darkies rather than hant. The time to travel and learn about my subject was the following year. Agents were largely interested.

[illegible]

The editor of the Hampshire Gazette, Northampton, Mass. was called upon by a citizen of that county, some weeks ago, who expressed himself earnestly in favor of Annexation. The editor pressed him to tell the reason of his advocating a measure so unjust to Mexico and so discreditable to our country, extending and perpetuating, evidently would, the curse of slavery. He replied, "I will be honest about it. I own land in Texas."

for consumers, it would be worth a while to consider whether it would not be wiser to conquer China, where there are enough of them to make it an object. Or, if the views of nullifiers to the benefit of "Eastern manufacturers," are too moderate for this, they might at least make a treaty with *Haiti*, which would, without the expense and hazards of war, secure us more customers than there are inhabitants in Texas. There is still another peaceful and infallible method of making a market for "Eastern manufactures." It is found that the emancipated negroes of the British West Indies consume *four times* the quantity of manufactures that they did as slaves. If these Southern gentlemen wish to provide consumers of "Eastern manufactures," let them convert their slaves into freemen. It would probably increase the demand for clothing at least \$50,000,000 per annum!

During the last winter I conversed much with the ablest and fastest friends of protection in both Houses of Congress, and there was not one who did not set it down as certain, that Annexation would seal the doom of our Northern industry. Many of them, not hitherto friendly to abolition, admitted that Abolitionists had detected and exposed the secret cause of the war which the Southern slaveholders, aided by their Northern understrappers, have waged upon Northern industry through the instrumentality of capricious and deleterious legislation. If "Eastern manufacturers" and merchants are deceived by a trick so maladroit,

And if we did interfere, for us to interfere, is justification for enslaving men, they would deserve to receive chains, whips, and tickles on the plantation of a Texan brigand.

But it is urged that Abolition will be the means of abolishing Slavery in the old Slave States as fast as it could be in a few ones. What then do we gain for Liberty and Humanity, especially as slaves are treated much more cruelly in planting than in "Slave States"? But these men tell us that Abolition will *destroy* Eastern manufactures; then why not also the *South*? The annexation of Texas would have about the same tendency to abolish Slavery in the old slave States, that opening a new market for wool, and prohibiting the importation of wool and woollens, *under penalty of death*, would have to abolish wool-growing in New-England and New-York!

We are told that Texas was once ours—"all our own," to use a favorite phrase of Mr. Walker. Hence he calls the proposed robbery, re-annexation, and thereupon the "harmonious Democracy" sing

The message related to the settlement of difficulties existing between us and Spain, in relation to the boundaries of Louisiana. The message made no specific recommendation, but it was privately disclosed to the Committee to which it was referred; that the object was to obtain an appropriation of *two millions of dollars*. John Randolph, Chairman of the Committee, waited on Mr. Jefferson on the same day, and was informed by him that the money was wanted for the purchase of Florida. Mr. Randolph refused to support the proposition, unless the President would say this officially. At the meeting of the Committee on the next day, December 7th, Mr. Bidwell, of Massachusetts, construed the message into a requisition of money for *foreign intercourse*. Mr. Randolph moved that the use of the sum proposed, viz: two millions, be limited to the specific object of purchasing Florida, which was agreed to in Committee, but the limitation was stricken out in the House. The bill was taken up in secret session, and Mr. Farnum of Massachusetts, stated that the measure was in conformity with the secret views of the Executive. It was passed in secret, and two millions of the people's money submitted to Executive discretion. *It was immediately sent to Bonaparte, for what purpose, has not been disclosed, and will probably never be authentically known.* Mr. Randolph, theretofore, an ardent friend and supporter of Jefferson, resisted the whole proceeding, and after it was consummated, denounced it in a pamphlet to the people.

Louisiana was never described, either by La Salle, when he took possession of it, or by the French while they possessed it, except as the country watered by the Mississippi and its tributaries. This of course does not include Texas, none of its rivers being connected, directly, or indirectly, with the Mississippi. It was ceded by France to Spain, retaken by Spain to France, and ceded by France to the United States, with no description, but that of "the province of Louisiana, as previously possessed" by the successive grantors.

The French writers speak of La Salle's journeys in Texas as having been performed *in Mexico*. La Salle himself took no formal possession of the Bay of St. Bernard. In 1838 Mr. Adams, who knows as much about this matter as any man living, declared in the House of Representatives, that "this very claim (to Texas) was as flimsy a claim as was ever set up by one nation against another;" and no member, rabid as many were for the acquisition, ventured to gainsay it. Two years before, he had stated in the same place, that Mr. Monroe, who negotiated the purchase of Louisiana—who was one of the negotiators in Spain and at Paris in 1805-6, and who had followed this question of the

boundary line of Louisiana from the beginning of it to the end, declared at the time of the Florida treaty that "he had no confidence in the claim." And yet because Mr. Adams, acting as attorney to the government, (under a watched and disreputable custom of Christian diplomacy, advanced dishonestly a claim to the province, he has been created as decisive authority in favor of our pretended right, and of the proposed reclamation. This is another of the disgusting impositions attempted to be practiced by Polkers and speculators up on the people.

In 1806, a body of Spanish troops passed the *Sabine*, and General Wilkinson, Commander-in-Chief of U. S. A. was sent by our Government to repel them. In the orders, issued by General Dearborn, Secretary of War, by "special" direction of Mr. Jefferson, Wilkinson was instructed to explain to the Governor of Texas, "that the quiet possession of the country by the United States, east of the *Sabine*, (with the trifling exception of the place called Bayou Pierre,) ought, and will be considered as fully within the limits of the country, surrendered to us on taking possession of Natchitoches; and therefore, any attempt of his Catholic Majesty's officers to disturb the existing state of things, by endeavoring to occupy any new post east of the *Sabine*, must be considered by the Government of the United States as an actual invasion of our territorial rights, and will be resisted as such."

This letter was dated May 6, 1806. General Wilkinson marched towards the *Sabine*, but the Spanish having retired to the west bank of the river, no collision took place, and it was immediately agreed between him and Herrera, Governor of Texas, that both parties should regard "as disputed territory," a strip of land extending about forty miles east of the *Sabine*, i. e. to a conventional line up to which the Spanish claimed, and had undoubtedly possessed, for they had an old missionary establishment a few miles west of Natchitoches, called *Maria Santissima de Guadalupe*, founded in 1715. In that year, four Frenchmen, having passports from the Governor of Louisiana, entered Texas for the purpose of buying cattle at the Spanish missions. They were immediately sent by the authorities of Texas to the city of Mexico, agreeably to the habitual policy pursued by the Spanish colonial government, of excluding all foreigners. It is scarcely necessary to say that these passports were evidence enough that the French Governor considered the men as not about to journey in *Louisiana*.

The conventional line run from the Gulf of Mexico, between the rivers Calcasieu and Mermentau, northwardly a few miles west of Natchitoches, to the Red River. Wilkinson and his aid-de-camp, Col. Burling, speak of the territory west of the

the less odious name of conquest, the original and long standing project of obtaining more slave territory; and finally that the slaveholders, the Locofocos, and John Tyler, have labored to excite the West on the subject of Oregon, and the whole country on the subject of the British claim of visitation for the detection of slave-trading pirates, with the intent to get the United States into a war with Great Britain and Mexico, chiefly for the purpose of consummating the grand conspiracy for obtaining Texas, and extending and perpetuating Slavery.

Now, therefore, if Slavery could be laid out of the question, I for one would oppose Annexation to my last breath. Eternal justice, the violated laws of hospitality, the discouragement of ingratitude and fraud, the moral sentiment, and the universal interests of mankind demand that this hideous mass of crime should be suppressed, and a world nuisance abated. All this will speedily be done, unless the criminals are protected with the broad shield, and taken to the bosom of this Republic; which may God of his infinite mercy forever avert.

* * * *

For fifteen years I have striven according to my humble means, at home and abroad, in public and in private, by speech and by press, to expose and defeat these frightful and stupendous machinations. And now, when a great and honorable, and I trust invincible party, with a statesman of unimpeachable integrity, unsurpassed ability, and powerful character at their head, have come up to the same work, is it my absolute brethren who require me to turn from our enemy and fight our own battles?

My position or my principles are not changed — The change is in others, not in me, and it is for them to justify the aid they are indirectly lending to a party, the most deadly and hideous in its hostility to justice, liberty, philanthropy, peace, and progress.

The Whigs, in my opinion, are the only sincere and true Union men. For ten years and upwards they have acted, though not as often and thoroughly as they ought, and as I wished, yet they have acted repeatedly and powerfully in defence of human rights, and more especially for the conservation of the great constitutional instrumentalities, the right of petition, the freedom of the press, of speech and debate, by which alone we assert these rights, and by which alone they can be powerfully, patriotically, or successfully asserted. The Whig party is composed of men, more intelligent as a general thing, more independent, disinterested, and humane than their opponents. They have shown, that as a party, they can neither be moved by the violence nor seduced by the corruption of Slavery. The

very first act they performed on their accession to power in 1811, was a sacrifice to principle unparalleled in the history of party contests.—I mean the rescission of the gag-rule. I have regarded that act as the principal cause of their overthrow.

Had they shown the same subserviency to slaveholding tyranny interest, and ambition, as the Locofocos have ever done, had they for the sake of Federal offices, honors and emoluments re-erected that role, and yielded up all the important *committees* to that habitual jealousy and arrogance, which Locofocos have done nothing but fawn upon and confirm—they would have been in power now; and *they*, instead of Democrats, falsely so called, would have had the offices and would have become, like them, the base deceivers, or the contemptible fools of Tyler. And I look upon it as a cheering evidence, not only of the progress of our cause, but also of the prevailing moral soundness of the American people, that a party which lost power so virtuously and nobly, is about to recover it with interest.

And now, friend Fulton, what shall we say of the other side. I would rejoice, and regard it as the greatest kindness, if you would show me how I can vote for any one but Henry Clay, or how I can omit voting, without helping Polk and Slavery. For many years I have refused to vote at all, unless the political parties put up men who would do Anti-Slavery work; and then I have voted indiscriminately for Whigs or Locos. I did so upon the ground that Slavery is such a master principle of injustice, corruption, and ruin, in the administration of the Government,—so perverts, clouds and obscures every important measure, appointment and department, that I have come at last to believe that an office-bearer, who is prepared for Anti-Slavery work, can do but little harm, and one who is not so prepared, but little good, whatever he may think on the other questions now, or likely to be agitated among us. In the present Congress, and in the last few Congresses, with the exception of one, and the absence of all the most important questions, voting with the Whigs.

The Locofoco party, containing, I cheerfully admit, individuals who have acted up on principles, and with an independence which does them the highest honor, is, nevertheless, profligate and pro-slavery. In Congress and the State Legislatures they have trampled on our dearest rights, and on the cardinal principles of their pretended creed, in order to retain power, and get office, by supporting the tyrannical encroachments, and the destructive and degrading demands of Slavery. They have plumed

*See Wise's letter to the Gilmor dinner party, Virginia, 1841.

tion, 51 Northern Democrats, 1 Northern Whig, and 70 Southern members, voted in the affirmative; and 59 Northern Whigs, and 15 Northern Democrats in the Negative. This was the first *gag law*, as it not only suppressed the right of petition on the part of the people, but also the right of their representatives to make a motion, or utter a word in the House. Of the Northern men who opened their mouths to take the gag, 41 were Democrats, and 1 Whig. All the Southern members, 70 in number, united to put it in and bind it on. Of those who made resistance, 59 were Northern Whigs and 15 Northern Democrats. Majority for the resolution, 48. Of course, less than half the Northern Democrats who voted for it, could have defeated it.

On the 12th day of December, 1828, the same resolution was moved by *Atherton*, of New Hampshire, with the addition of an insidious phrase, viz: "Upon presentation thereof" which created a doubt whether petitions were in reality *received* under this resolution. Thus with stealthy step, cowardice and conscious guilt advanced to the open outrage of the following session. That the manner of proceeding might be in keeping with the object, the mover made a lengthy speech, and closed by moving the previous question, which his accomplices sustained, wisely precluding reply. The vote stood for the resolution Northern Democrats 55, Northern Whigs 1, Southern members, without distinction of party, 72; against the resolution, Northern Whigs 62, Northern Democrats 12, Southern Whigs 3, Southern Democrats 1.

The preceding resolutions being simple orders of the House, were subject to the will of the majority, if they should see fit at any time to refer a petition, but the slaveholders, encouraged by these repeated proofs, that their Northern mercenaries feared neither God nor their constituents, proceeded to give the mortal stroke to the freedom of debate and the right of petition. On the 28th day of January, 1840, the House voted to add to its standing rules and orders, (which cannot be dispensed with or rescinded during the session without a majority of two-thirds,) the following, viz:—

"No petition, memorial, or other paper, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or territory, or the slave-trade between the States or territories of the United States, in which it now exists, shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way whatever."

As usual, the previous question was called and free breath stifled. There were in favor of this infamous rule, Northern Democrats 27, Northern Whigs 1, Southern members 84; and against it, Northern Whigs 61, Northern Democrats 38, Southern Whigs 4, majority 6; wanting only three of the Northern Democratic votes to have defeated

it. This rule has been regularly renewed at every session, except when the Whigs were in power, with ranks as yet unbroken. At the opening of the first session of a Whig Congress, Mr. Adams moved to rescind the rule, arguing the motion as a necessary branch of Whig policy in opposition to the gag and *lettre de cachet* system of the party just then discarded by the nation. From this doctrine not a Whig expressed dissent. In favor of the motion, there were Northern Whigs 78, Northern Democrats 30, Southern Whigs 4; against it, Northern Democrats 21, Northern Whigs 1, and Southern members 82. On motion of a Democrat from Pennsylvania, this vote was subsequently reconsidered and the gag restored by a majority of 2. At the beginning of every session since, Mr. Adams, unfaltering and untiring in the discharge of his duty, and as confessedly the leader of the Whigs in the House of Representatives, as he is of those favorable to abolition, has repeated his motion, for the rescission of the gag rule. At the regular session of 1841-2, the rule was sustained by a vote of 96 to 88; majority 8. In the session of 1842-3 it was sustained by 105 to 102; majority 4. In these cases the division was just about the same as in the preceding. I have not at hand the means of an accurate analysis, but the Washington letters of those periods, represent the Northern Democrats to have gone, as a party, with the slaveholders for the gag, and the Whigs almost to a man, against it. At the late session, after the gag rule had been stricken, once by a majority of 20, its friends avoided the effect of that vote by refusing to adopt the rules as amended; and a previous motion having been adopted that the rules of the preceding session be observed until otherwise ordered, the 21st, now the 25th Rule, was thus left in full force. This is the last vote which has been taken annulling the right of petition, and the liberty of speech, and debate.— There were for it, Northern Democrats 26, Northern Whigs 0, Southern members, without distinction of party 62; against it, Northern Whigs 44, Northern Democrats 38, and Southern Whigs 5; majority for the gag, 1.

The Northern Democratic vote against the gag, which on the preceding evening was 55, had been reduced during the night no less than 17! Of these, 8 were absent or *dodged*, as it is called, and 9 changed their votes. No Whig changed his vote, and there was but one, Hardin of Illinois, absent—Duncan, of Ohio, and Davis, of Indiana, had both made speeches against the rule, and on the final question voted against it; but when they found that a majority had voted the same way, and that the slave-driving Virginia speaker was making an awful pause before declaring the decision of the House,

by a United States Squadron, under Commodore Jones. I have no doubt that this was done in pursuance of secret, as it was in conformity with the spirit of public orders of Tyler and Upshur, the latter being then Secretary of the Navy. One proof of this is, that Jones has never been brought to trial or an *inquiry*. I predicted this, as you may see in the pamphlet to which I have referred, from the moment that the extraordinary outrage was announced. I believed it to be a phenomenon, throwing out a little light from a dark and awful system of gradual usurpation by means of a little force and a great deal of diplomacy, solely for the aggrandizement of the slave power, and the slave interest in this republic. The active brain of the late Secretary of State had conceived, and his unblenching hardihood and ambition prepared to execute it. It will be remembered that the invasions and depredations committed by General Jackson in Florida, whether they were avowed or disavowed by our Government, did greatly facilitate the negotiation for the surrender of that province. Mr. Adams moved a resolution condemning the Monterey outrage, the most base and unprovoked of its kind.—For this resolution there were Northern Whigs 58, Southern Whigs 16; and against it, Northern Democrats 31, Northern Tyler men 1, Northern Whigs 1, Southern Members chiefly Democrats 11. Such a vote as this, and other circumstances incline me to rely on Southern Whig Slaveholders for patriotism, and respect for the rights of man and of nations, much more than upon Northern servile Democrats.

The effect of slave labor to kill land, and the consequent impotence of a large portion of the South to possess themselves of the rich reservations of the Indians, were at the bottom of the perfidious and expensive scheme of banishing those original and rightful proprietors. The Whigs always opposed this dishonest and cruel policy; and they opposed the Florida war, a branch of it.

In 1836, Calhoun, pursuing the recommendation contained in the annual message of President Jackson, brought into the Senate a bill to establish a censorship upon newspaper and other printed matter, circulated through the Post-Office. The bill proposed to make every petty postmaster a *censor*, to invest him with authority to establish his *index expurgatorius*, and to circulate or suppress at his pleasure, any publication. It made him the sole judge, in secret inquisition, of what he should suppress, and what he should permit to go to the people. For this bill, 16 Democrats and two Whigs gave their yeas, and against it, 9 Whigs and 9 Democrats their nays. There was a tie, and Mr. Calhoun called aloud, "Where is the Vice President,"

[Mr. Van Buren.] He was on hand, and immediately resumed the chair, and gave his casting vote for the bill; but it was finally defeated, chiefly by the Whigs.*

On the 6th of February, 1837, the question of the reception of Anti-Slavery petitions was first raised in the Senate. A great number of those petitions having been presented, the motion was made that they be received, whereupon Mr. Hubbard, of New Hampshire, moved that this motion lie on the table. In favor of this, there were Southern Democrats 20, Southern Whigs 5, Northern Democrats 7; against it, Northern Whigs 9, Northern Democrats 5, Southern Whigs [Henry Clay] 1. I have referred to this vote, because it was the first of the kind, and not because it is most favorable to the character of Whigs. They have given many better votes on the same question. On the 8th of February, 1839, Mr. Clay of Alabama, moved to lay the question of considering *Morris's* resolution against Slavery and the Slave-trade, on the table. For this there were Democrats 20, Whigs 2; against it, Whigs 10; including *Clay*, of Kentucky, and Democrats 5.

In February, 1839, and again in January, 1840, the Whig Senators, with Mr. Clay at their head, voted against the armed occupation of Florida, and they resisted every attempt of Jackson and Van Buren's administrations, to involve us in a war with Mexico, ostensibly for a bundle of claims, mostly trumped up, but in reality to cover robbery with the specious name of conquest. This was a shadow of the Texas treaty, cast across the path of the Whig Senators; and they behaved precisely as we should wish them to do, if we could now dictate in presence of the event, the manner of preparing for it. I think that the Whigs did at that time save us from war, a war having no real object but the extension and security of Slavery; and that they again saved us by the timely conclusion of the Ashburton Treaty. There is no doubt that the Abolitionists saw with regret and alarm the healing of a wound, which they wished to keep open, both as increasing the chances of war, and as furnishing means of irritating the North at any moment into a blind concurrence in their wicked and deep-laid scheme of slave aggrandizement. I am persuaded that if that Treaty had not been made and ratified while Tyler thought it still politic to keep measure with the

The following was the vote on the passage of the bill to be enclosed.—Whigs 148.

YEAS—Black, Brown, Buchanan, Calhoun, Cuthbert, Goldsborough, Grundy, King, Mc King, M. Moore, Nicholas, Preston, Rives, Robinson, Tallmadge, Walker, White, Wright.

NAYS—Benton, Clay, Davis, Ewing, Bl. Ewing, Ohio, Hendricks, Hubbard, Kent, Niles, Morris, Prentiss, Ruggles, Shepley, Southard, Swift, Tomlinson, Wall, Webster.

On the final question, Mr. Goldsborough returned to his Whig friends, and voted against the bill.

Wings, it would have been made at all, and we should most likely have been in the midst of a war with Great Britain and Mexico at this moment.

On the 11th of June, 1838, the Texas question was brought before the Senate by Mr. Preston, of South Carolina, a man who seems to have in stake his party, in the shape of a resolution for the re-annexation of Texas. To keep properly before us the affinities of important agents of the Texas plot, I observe here that this individual threatened in the Senate, to hang, in spite of all the Governments upon earth, including the Federal, every Abolitionist who set his foot in South Carolina; and that he boasted of the Compromise Act as the work of "the Southern whip." Mr. Preston's resolution was laid on the table, 24 to 14, Clay, Webster, and all the Wings, except 2, voting in the affirmative; and 12 Democrats, including Benton, Calhoun and Walker, in the negative. The Wing party also voted against the recognition of the independence of Texas, on the 13th of February, 1837, and on the 1st and 2nd of March, following. On the latter day, the motion was to reconsider the vote of recognition passed on the preceding. Upon this, the Senate were equally divided; and if the Vice-President had been as ready to interpose his casting vote against this Texas conspiracy, as against the liberty of the press, we should have been saved from the disgrace of a measure which experience has shown to have been impudently wrong in every view.

But while these things were transpiring in the Senate, one of the most remarkable and well-sustained parliamentary contests that ever befell on record, was going on in the House of Representatives. During three years, a system of suppressing petitions, motions, and resolutions for information relating to Texas had been in practice. The remonstrances of five Northern Wing Legislatures, viz: those of Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island Ohio and Michigan, together with the petitions and remonstrances of more than a hundred thousand citizens, against Annexation, had been laid on the table without reading, printing, or debate. Darkness as deep as the dungeons of the Inquisition, enveloped Congress and the nation,—and while the savage veil of war burst upon Mexico from our Presidential mansion, and was echoed by convenient committees of both Houses, nothing was allowed to be drawn from the Executive, or said on the floor, or printed, which could throw any light on the real nature of the intended war. In this deplorable and perilous state of our public concerns, a ray of light in the Annexation scheme, penetrated the murky obfuscating gloom. It was a light which, like that of hell, made "darkness visible." The Legislature of Missouri, upon Calhoun's Texas sec-

and South Carolina, had passed resolutions in favor of Annexation, and directed them to be laid before both Houses of Congress. They were presented, but were laid on the table like the rest, under a rule which, like Phalaris' bull, was now found as fatal to the inventor, as to his victims. This unforeseen consequence operated like an electric stroke upon the slave families of the House. The idea of suppressing the voice of sovereign States began to appear shocking and intolerable to the "State Rights" and "Strict Construction" party!

"Thus even hallowed justice
Commends the ingredients of our poisoned chalice
To our own lips."

Never was this saying of nature's great interpreter more curiously verified. The annexationists now demanded the reverence of their resolutions, and the result was that those of Massachusetts and other free States, and all the petitions and remonstrances against Annexation, having got at last into respectable company, were permitted under its wing to be ushered into the presence of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Committee, however, did not, if their own statement is true, deign to look at one of them, but reported "that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of them, and that they be laid on the table." Mr. *Waddy Thompson* announced to remonstrate, with instructions "to report a resolution directing the President to make the proper preparations for the Annexation of Texas to the United States."

To this, Mr. Adams moved an amendment, declaring that there was no power under the Constitution to annex a foreign State; and that any act of Congress, or Treaty attempting to annex Texas to the United States, would be null and void, and ought to be resisted and annulled by the people.—And now Mr. Adams had the floor, and never was floor better occupied than was this by him, during "the morning hour" from the 16th of June to the 5th of July. He laid open the awful and tremendous slave-trading, and land speculating conspiracy. He has won ample and immortal honors in overthrowing, in 1837 and 1842, formidable combinations, to expel him from the House or degrade him in it; but the historian will probably dwell with most enthusiasm upon his timely and masterly exposure of the Texas conspiracy in spite of all, in the midst of the efforts of the majority to hold the gag in his mouth. Then was the real battle unconsciously fought. It is not too much to say, that if an exposure of the plot had not been made then, it would have succeeded now. On all these occasions Mr. Adams was bucked in the body of the Wing party. So was Mr. Caddings when he dared to question the principles propounded by Calhoun and acted upon by the Executive, in the case of the

Credie. Without this support, those honest and intrepid servants of the people would, in all probability, have been overpowered and crushed, and ambition, avarice and fraud—shrouded in impenetrable mystery—would have completed the work they had prosperously begun. Just before this Dr. Channing had addressed his letter to Mr. Clay on the subject of Annexation; and I well remember what confidence and satisfaction were diffused throughout the anti-slavery ranks by the reported reply of Mr. Clay, viz: that Dr. Channing need be under no apprehension that Texas would be annexed. The relief which many an anxious bosom experienced from that declaration is still recollected by Abolitionists; and that recollection speaks trumpet-tongued of the high and well known trustiness and honor of Henry Clay.

I hope you will weigh well the votes I have stated and the facts to which I have referred; and that you will carry the investigation still farther, for there is plenty of room. Hundreds of such votes, given by the respective parties in Congress and in State legislatures, affecting deeply the success of our sacred cause, and serving in their time as steps by which we mounted towards our present secure eminence, are now indistinctly remembered or entirely forgotten. The few I have cited are enough to show the intrinsic character and natural bias of the parties. When they were given and placed upon record, there was not much for a politician to hope or fear from Abolitionists. Men felt free, and rather more than free to act towards us just as they felt. It was deemed a merit to treat us with contumely, and political capital could be thus made.

I see, therefore, in these votes proof that the Whig party are possessed of humanity, independence, considerateness, habitual reverence for natural and Constitutional rights, for justice, and the free working of the human soul. They cannot be driven by Executive power or popular frenzy, nor seduced by the plaudits of the many, nor the blandishments of the few, to do essential wrong to their country, their constituents, or to other nations.—The misfortune of their opponents is to have no character except what circumstances, temptation, and opportunity may impress upon them for the time.—I should feel that nothing valuable, which they could award with applause, profit and impunity, would be any where safe. Constitutional barriers have been no more heeded by them than twigs in the way of the wild boar. They take their name from *demus* as the Jesuits did from *Jesus*, and they hold (if to anything) to the fundamental maxim of that once formidable society, "the end sanctifies the means." They have defined their position

thus:—"All's fair in politics." "The spoils of the victors." These are the alpha and omega of their political ethics and their political economy. One of themselves to whom *they* have always given a high character for honesty and sagacity, uttered the most memorable of his *memorabilia*, when he said "their only cement is the cohesive power of public plunder."

Strict limitations and a jealous watchfulness of Executive power is a democratic principle; and the apprehension that the Federal Constitution had provided for an Executive, which would be too strong, and in process of time become dangerous to liberty, was one of the great grounds of opposition by the anti-Federal, or original Democratic party, to the formation and ratification of this Constitution. But for the last sixteen years, to go no further back, the Democrats, falsely so called, have sustained and encouraged Executive acts, experiments, and adventures, far transcending the Constitution, and scorned its obvious and cautious restrictions.

Strict economy and accountability in the use of the people's money is a democratic principle, but Jackson and Van Buren's administrations run up the Government expenditure from *thirteen to thirty-three millions* per annum; and the accounts and superintendence of the national finances were so loose and negligent that a single officer carried on embezzlements during seven or eight years to the amount of more than a million of dollars without detection, and with impunity.

Non-interference of federal officers in elections is a democratic principle. I remember when the Democrats of Boston considered that it would use them up to have a custom house officer take any part in their popular meetings and elections, except to listen of an evening and deposite his vote. Now it is common in all the principal cities for Executive dependents to be the officers and creators, and sometimes to constitute the main and even entire body of a political gathering. They have even left the posts, traversing the country day and night, and consulting it with their vend machines.

The protection and encouragement of home manufactures is an old democratic principle. During a Democratic Democracy, one of the first things I did on entering into active life, was to join an association, formed by our other political friends, for the encouragement of our American industry. We took a pledge to wear no cloth except of Am. domestic manufacture. This was in 1818. We continued our association, and kept the pledge, until, by the fall of 1841, "the American system" was supposed to be finally and definitively established.

The observance of justice and rectitude, and the maintenance of "peace, friendship and honest com-

"peace with all nations" is an old democratic doctrine, which used to be blazoned on our banners; and when, in 1806, an expedition "was set on foot" and "prepared" in the United States, to attack Texas, Mr. Jefferson ordered military detachments to take positions on the Ohio and Mississippi, and sink, destroy or capture the boats and men descending those rivers for that purpose. Under the late and present democratic dynasties, such expeditions have proceeded openly, and not only without molestation, but with the aid of officers of Government, whose sworn duty it was to prosecute such offenders to condign punishment. At this moment a self-constituted committee sits in the Capitol, and sends forth under the franking privilege, and through the organs of the Democratic party, invitations and arguments to the idle, and lawless, and rapacious, all over the country, to combine, arm, organize, (either as soldiers or emigrants, it makes no difference which, not at all!) and march, rob, and murder a friendly and unoffending people, with whom we have solemn, and on their part, unbroken treaties of limits, peace, friendship, and commerce. The worst thing about it is that this great and dangerous misdemeanor, for which our laws have provided the punishment of fine, and imprisonment for years, *i. e.* for the mere "setting on foot" or "preparing" such an expedition, has grown so common and customary, that the country has come to regard it with a callous indifference. If, as the sequel of these harmless proceedings, privateers unloosed from every port, and manned by villains of all nations, and especially Texans and Americans, shall sweep our commerce from the ocean, we shall remember with rarer and unavailing regret, the apathy with which we are looking upon the daring and criminal manifestoes issued by R. J. Walker, W. W. Payne, and the editors of the Washington Globe.

It is a democratic principle that office be given to the most worthy; but they have come to be generally bestowed upon inferior and bad men, and it has been officially assigned as a reason for not removing them when detected in public robbery, that their pursuers would probably be equally as principled, and more hungry.

It is a democratic principle that Executive offices, except the highest, local and departmental, ought not to be conferred upon the representatives of the people; and yet, in eight years only, Jackson appointed more members of Congress to offices, many of them inferior and gainful merely, than all his predecessors together.

Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of petition, and the diffusion of information among the people, are cardinal points of democracy. The Democrats have gagged the representatives

of the people, have attempted to impose a censorship upon the press for the comfort and security of Slavery, and have voted in innumerable cases against printing for dissemination among the people, memorials, resolutions, and remonstrances of sovereign States, and reports, and diplomatic correspondence, which would have informed the people of corrupt and high-handed acts done and designed to be done in their abused name. The right of petition has been openly trampled down and ground under the heel for ten years, and the national organ of the party, (the Democratic Review,) has propounded and maintained, without dissent on the part of a single Democratic press, that:—

"The absence of such power [Constitutional power to grant the prayer of a petition] is not necessary to confer the right of a refusal to receive.—*A settled prejudgment or predetermination on the part of the body under its high responsibility to conscience and to public opinion, is sufficient.*"

This is the power of the Cæsars, and of the Norman conquerors, "*Sic volo, sic jubeo, sicreto — Stat pro ratione voluntas.*"

Anti-Slavery, or equal, impartial, and universal liberty is the greatest of Democratic doctrines.—The Anti-Federalists, or original Democrats, opposed the adoption of the Constitution on this very ground, among others, that contrary to the whole gist of the American revolution, it permitted the enslaving of human beings, and conferred upon their enslavers political power, just in proportion as they violated this first principle of a free republic. But modern Democracy has become the chief prop of Slavery.

And why is all this? It is because Democrats have allied themselves with Slavery for the sake of the federal offices, dignities, and emoluments, and the price they have stipulated to pay is blind obedience and entire submission to the will of slaveholders. And inasmuch as none but inferior and dishonest men would embrace such corruption and submit to such degradation, hence it has happened that such extensive and continued depredations have been committed upon the Treasury of the Nation; and hence also the repudiation of the fundamental and self-evident doctrine of Democracy, that offices and honors should be bestowed upon the most worthy.

I need not say what party is the complete antipodes of the Locofoco on all these points. I might add to them a great many others, subordinate, perhaps, in importance, but bringing up contrasts equally striking; and I now put it to you, to every Abolitionist, and to every discerning man in the

"The ancient form in which the Norman King of England used to enact laws. The meaning is, 'Thus I will, I do, I order, I decree. My will' and 'for reason.'"

land, whether the main political reliance of the friends of justice, humanity, and universal emancipation must not necessarily, in this country, be placed upon the Whig Party. And this Whig Party goes security for Henry Clay's fidelity to their known principles and habits of action, and their long established system of policy.

But Clay needs no security. He is a man, who would be more likely, from a false sense of honor, to keep a bad promise than he would, for want of common honesty, to violate a good one.

Indeed the question has not been raised by any party or person, whether Henry Clay would keep a promise; but some have denied that he has made one. If he has not done it, and done it clearly and beyond cavil, then I oppose him to the death; then will I traverse the land day and night, calling upon the people to awake from their fatal security. But first let us see whether Henry Clay is really trying his hand at a swindle. A mistake in this matter would not only be very unjust to him, but extremely discreditable and injurious to ourselves. We must take all his words together. This is a rule which we apply to the meanest wretch arraigned at the bar of justice.

In the first place, as to the means by which Mexico has been dismembered, Texas severed from her, and put *de facto* in a condition to treat for Annexation, he says:—

"The signal success of that revolution was *greatly aided, if not wholly achieved*, by citizens of the United States, who had migrated to Texas. The success, if they could not always be prevented by the Government of the United States, were furnished in a manner, and to an extent which brought upon us some national reproach in the eyes of an impartial world. And in my opinion they impose on us the obligation of scrupulously avoiding the imputation of having instigated and aided the revolution with the ultimate view of territorial aggrandizement."

Secondly, as to the *motive*, he says:

"It is useless to disguise that there are those who espouse, and those who oppose the Annexation of Texas, upon the ground of the influence which it would exert in the balance of political power between the two great sections of the Union. I conceive that no motive for the acquisition of foreign territory would be more unfortunate, or pregnant with more fatal consequences to the Confederacy, than that of obtaining it for the purpose of strengthening one part against another part of the common Confederacy. Such a principle, put into practical operation, would menace the existence, if it did not certainly sow the seeds of a dissolution of the Union. It would be to proclaim to the world an insatiable and unquenchable thirst for foreign conquest or acquisition of territory. For if to-day Texas be required to strengthen one part, to-morrow Canada may be required to add strength to another, and after that might have been obtained, still other and further acquisitions would become necessary.

"Suppose Great Britain and France, or one of them, were to take part with Mexico, and by a manifesto, were to proclaim that their objects were to assist a weak and helpless ally to check the spirit of encroachment and ambition of an already overgrown republic, seeking still further acquisitions of territory; to maintain the independence of Texas, disconnected with the United States, and to prevent the propagation of slavery from the United States, what would be the effect of such allegations upon the judgment of an impartial and enlightened world?"

"I was aware, too, that holders of Texas lands, and Texas scrip, and speculators in them, were actively engaged in promoting the object of Annexation."

Thirdly, as to the consequences, he says:

"Under the circumstances, if the Government of the United States were to acquire Texas, it would acquire along with it all the encumbrances which Texas is under, and among them the actual or suspended war between Mexico and Texas. *Annexation and war with Mexico are identical*. Now for one, I certainly am not willing to involve this country in a foreign war for the object of acquiring Texas. I know there are those who regard such a war with indifference, and as a trifling affair, on account of the weakness of Mexico, and her inability to inflict serious injury upon this country. But I do not look upon it thus lightly. I regard all wars as great calamities, to be avoided if possible, and honorable peace as the wisest and truest policy of this country. What the United States most need, are union, peace, and patience. Nor do I think that the weakness of a power should form a motive, in any case, for inducing us to engage in, or to depreciate the evils of war. Honor, and good faith, and justice, are equally due from this country towards the weak as towards the strong. And if an act of injustice were to be perpetrated towards any power, it would be more compatible with the dignity of the nation, and in my judgment less dishonorable to inflict it upon a powerful, instead of a weak foreign nation. But are we perfectly sure that we should be free from injury in a state of war with Mexico? Have we any security that countless numbers of foreign vessels, under the authority and flag of Mexico, would not prey upon our defenceless commerce in the Mexican Gulf, on the Pacific ocean, and on every other sea and ocean? What commerce, on the other hand, does Mexico offer, as an indemnity for our losses, to the gallantry and enterprize of our countrymen? This view of the subject supposes that the war would be confined to the United States and Mexico as the only belligerents. But have we any certain guarantee that Mexico would obtain no allies among the great European Powers? Should Texas be annexed to the Union, the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, be its amount what it may. What it is, I do not know certainly; but the least I have seen it stated at is thirteen millions of dollars. And this responsibility will exist, whether there be a stipulation in the treaty or not, expressly assuming the payment of the debt of Texas."

Fourthly, as to the *conditions* on which he leaves it to be inferred that he would or might consent to Annexation, he says:

"I have hitherto considered the question upon the supposition that the Annexation is attempted without the assent of Mexico. If she yields her consent, that would materially affect the foreign





